

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
FLORENCE DIVISION

Earnest E. Vaughn, Sr.,)	
<i>aka Earnest E. Vaughn,</i>)	
<i>aka Earnest Edward Vaughn, Sr.,</i>)	
<i>aka Earnest Edward Vaughn,</i>)	
<i>(formerly # 246912),</i>)	
)	
Petitioner,)	
)	Civil Action No. 8:07-3923-TLW-BHH
vs.)	
)	
Solicitor's Office, Greenwood County; and)	
Elizabeth White,)	
)	
Respondents.)	
_____)	

ORDER

Petitioner, Earnest E. Vaughn, Sr., (“petitioner”) submitted a Petition for Writ of Mandamus *pro se*. (Doc. #1).

This matter now comes before this Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) filed by United States Magistrate Judge Bruce H. Hendricks, to whom this case had previously been assigned. (Doc. #6). In the Report, Magistrate Judge Hendricks recommends that the District Court dismiss the petition without prejudice and without issuance and service of process on Respondents. (Doc. #6). The petitioner was put on notice that he may file objections to the Report. The petitioner has not filed objections to the Report.

In conducting review of the Report the Court applies the following standard:

The magistrate judge makes only a recommendation to the Court, to which any party may file written objections...The Court is not bound by the recommendation of the magistrate judge but, instead, retains responsibility for the final determination. The Court is required to make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report or

specified findings or recommendation as to which an objection is made. However, the Court is not required to review, under a *de novo* or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which no objections are addressed. While the level of scrutiny entailed by the Court's review of the Report thus depends on whether or not objections have been filed, in either case, the Court is free, after review, to accept, reject, or modify any of the magistrate judge's findings or recommendations.

Wallace v. Housing Auth. of the City of Columbia, 791 F. Supp. 137, 138 (D.S.C. 1992)

(citations omitted).

In light of the Wallace standard, the Court has carefully reviewed the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation. For the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation is **ACCEPTED** (Doc. #6) and the action is dismissed without prejudice and without issuance and service of process.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

S/Terry L. Wooten
Terry L. Wooten
United States District Judge

October 3, 2008
Florence, South Carolina